

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,765	12/17/2001	Hiroshi Komatsu	8733.250.21	3771
30827 75	590 05/29/2003			
	LONG & ALDRIDG	EXAMINER		
1900 K STREE WASHINGTO	•		CHOWDHURY, TARIFUR RASHID	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2871 DATE MAILED: 05/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/015,765	KOMATSU, HIROSHI	
nariosi y riodon	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tarifur R Chowdhury	2871	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 14 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	roid abandonment of this applica a a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply h places the applica	y to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejecti HE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the control of the contro	f extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate or the final originally set in the final	opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) They raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);	
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c)  they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claim	S.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: 67.			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>33-66 and 68-71</u> .		•	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Exami	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		
10. Other:	-	thordh T. Chordh	udy
		Mimary Ex	caminer



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant has not filed a true english translation of the priority documents as claimed to perfect the priority date and thus eliminate Hebiguchi '43 and Hebiguchi '557 as valid prior arts. Further, as to applicant's argument that Hebiguchi '473 and Hebiguchi '557 and Kim fails to teach or suggest the features of claims 33, 48, 64 and 69, applicant's attention is respectfully requested to the office action mailed on 01/13/03 which clearly discloses that the above references teach or suggest the features of the indicated claims. Accordingly, it is considered by the examiner that the rejection was proper and thus maintained.